

From: total fitness
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov,activism(a)moraldefense....
Date: 1/24/02 8:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing regarding the Department of Justice's anti-trust case against Microsoft.

I have watched in dismay as the U.S. Government, whose constitutional duty it is to protect the rights of U.S. citizens, has zealously pursued one of the most productive individuals in U.S. history- Bill Gates, and his company Microsoft.

One of the Department of Justice's rationalisations for its crusade against Microsoft is that the company has engaged in 'anti-competitive' behaviour that has 'hurt consumers'.

I find this accusation ridiculous. Exactly who are all these wounded consumers? I have been happily using, and benefiting from, Windows 98, with Internet Explorer, on my computer for the last two years. Microsoft's products have greatly enhanced my productivity and made my life a lot easier.

I certainly do not feel 'hurt' in any way by Microsoft! Neither do my family and friends who enjoy the benefits of Gate's innovations. Evidently, neither do millions of others around the world who have purchased, and continue to purchase, Microsoft products of their own choice and free will.

If the Department of Justice is truly concerned with eradicating anti-competitive behaviour, then it should swiftly get out of the way of those who benefit America and the rest of the world- dynamic, competitive producers and innovators, like Microsoft- and let them do what they do best, free of unprovoked co-ercion.

Microsoft should only be the subject of legal action if it can be shown that it has used force or fraud in its dealings with others. I have not seen a skerrick of evidence to suggest this is the case. It is actually the government who has initiated force against Microsoft.

It appears the Microsoft case was initiated by competing companies, who, unable to compete on their own merits, lobbied the government to co-ercively restrain Microsoft in order to level the playing field. If these companies want an increase in market share, they should do it not through Government favours, but by appealing to consumers with more competitive offerings and innovations.

The Government's anti-trust stance is not untainted by hypocrisy, either. The U.S. Postal Service IS a true monopoly- it enjoys a privileged position in the market by virtue of government edict. It is not subject to competition from other firms who would no doubt be more than willing to supply consumers with alternative provision of mail services. However I am unaware of any pending anti-trust action against The U.S. Postal Service.

Yours faithfully,

Anthony Colpo.

Get your free Australian email account at <http://www.start.com.au>